UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

FILED

NOTICE OF DOCUMENT DISCREPANCIES

2008 JUL 15 PM 1: 17

This space for

		CLERK US DISTRIC: Clarate Office File States Southern district of California	mp
ТО	: U.S. DISTRIC	CT JUDGE / U. S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE Benitez	
FR	OM: K. Hammerly,	Deputy Clerk RECEITED DATE: 7/10/2008	
CA	SE NO.: <u>08cr1127</u>	DOCUMENT FILED BY: Deft Lucas-Garcia	
CASE TITLE: USA v. Lucas-Garcia			
DOCUMENT ENTITLED: Letter			
Upon the submission of the attached document(s), the following discrepancies are noted:			
1	Local Rule	Discrepancy	
	5.1	Missing time and date on motion and/or supporting documentation	
ō	5.3	Document illegible or submitted on thermal facsimile paper	
	5.4	Document not filed electronically. Notice of Noncompliance already issued.	
	7.1 or 47.1	Date noticed for hearing not in compliance with rules/Document(s) are not timely	y
	7.1 or 47.1	Lacking memorandum of points and authorities in support as a separate documen	ıt
	7.1 or 47.1	Briefs or memoranda exceed length restrictions	
	7.1	Missing table of contents	
	15.1	Amended pleading not complete in itself	
	30.1	Depositions not accepted absent a court order	
		Supplemental documents require court order	
		Default Judgment in sum certain includes calculated interest	
X		OTHER: Ex Parte Communication prohibited; Case Closed	
·			
		Date forwarded: <u>7/10/2008</u>	
ORDER OF THE JUDGE / MAGISTRATE JUDGE T IS HEREBY ORDERED:			
\mathcal{A}			
<u>~</u> .	The document is to be filed nunc pro tunc to date received.		
	The document is NOT to be filed, but instead REJECTED. and it is ORDERED that the Clerk serve a copy of this order on all parties.		
	Rejected document to be returned to pro se or inmate? Yes. Court Copy retained by chambers		
	Counsel is advised that any further failure to comply with the Local Rules may lead to penalties pursuant		
	to Local Rule 83.1	CHAMBERS OF: Revite	
		d O.T.	
	Dated: 7/14/0 cc: All Parties	В у: <u>V 2313</u>	